DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 756 IR 051 201

AUTHOR Collier, Carol; And Others
TITLE Collection Analysis Project. Report of the Task Force on Organization and Staffing.
INSTITUTION Wyoming Univ., Laramie. Univ. Libraries.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 61p.; For related documents, see IR 051 197-203.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; College Faculty; College Libraries; Committees; Departments; Higher Education; *Improvement Programs; *Library Acquisition; *Library Collection Development; *Library Personnel; Library Services; Occupational Information; Operations Research; *Organizational Effectiveness; Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS Association of Research Libraries; Subject Specialists; *University of Wyoming

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the existing organization of the collection development activities at the University of Wyoming Library, this task force report examines the staffing and functions of the Collection Development and Acquisitions Departments, the Collection Development Committee, the subject specialist/college academic department liaison program, teaching faculty participation in the collection development process, and gifts and exchange operations. Communication patterns, job descriptions, work flows, and areas of overlapping or undefined responsibility are analyzed. Existing accountability patterns and reporting relationships are considered. An analysis of strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for improvements of the Collection Development and Acquisitions Departments, Collection Development Committee, Subject Specialist/Liaison Program, and Gifts and Exchange Program are included. The formal charge for the Task Force on Organization and Staffing and a summary of the results of a survey of subject specialist/liaisons which gathered perceptions on effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses of the current program are appended. (MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259756

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING LIBRARIES

COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON

ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

May 1985

Task Force on Organization and Staffing:

Carol Collier, Chair
Julie Davis
Martha Hanscom
Janet Hazelton
Linda Keiter
Alice Marris

IR051201

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol A. Collier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....1
Collection Development Department: General Overview.....3
Acquisitions Department: General Overview.....4
Collection Development Committee: General Overview.....10
Subject Specialist/Liaison Program: General Overview.....12
Faculty Participation in Collection Development: General Overview..15
Gifts and Exchanges: General Overview.....15
Collection Development Department: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses.....19
Strengths.....19
Weaknesses.....19
Recommendations.....22
Acquisitions Department: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses.....23
Strengths.....23
Weaknesses.....23
Recommendations.....27
Collection Development Committee: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses.....29
Strengths.....29
Weaknesses.....30
Recommendations.....31
Subject Specialist/Liaison Program: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses.....32
Strengths.....32
Weaknesses.....33
Recommendations.....36
Faculty Participation in Collection Development: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses.....38
Strengths.....38
Weaknesses.....38
Recommendations.....39
Gifts and Exchanges: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses.....39
Strengths.....39
Weaknesses.....39
Recommendations.....42
Appendix A: Charge for the Task Force on Organization and Staffing.....45
Appendix B: Survey of Subject Specialist/Liaisons: Summary Results.....47

INTRODUCTION

The Cap Task Force on Organization and Staffing has focused on the existing organization of the collection development activities at the University of Wyoming Library. It has examined the staffing and functions of the Collection Development and Acquisitions departments, the Collection Development Committee, the subject specialist/liaison program, teaching faculty participation in the collection development process, and gift and exchange operations. Communication patterns, job descriptions, work flows, and areas of overlapping or undefined responsibility have been analyzed. Existing accountability patterns and reporting relationships were also considered.

Information presented in this report was drawn from a number of sources. The Task Force interviewed Library administrators, selected public and technical services department heads, the heads of Collection Development and Acquisitions, the Acquisitions Manager, Acquisitions Department staff, Collection Development Department staff and gifts and exchange personnel. The Task Force looked at job descriptions of all personnel in the Collection Development and Acquisitions departments, with special attention given to the job descriptions of the heads of these two departments and the Acquisitions Manager. Organization charts tracing the workflow through the Acquisitions Department were drawn up by Acquisitions staff and reviewed by the Task Force.

To gather perceptions on the effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses of the present subject specialist/liaison program, adequacy

of management information currently available for collection development purposes, and the effectiveness and role of the Collection Development Committee, the Task Force surveyed the subject specialist/liaisons. Twenty questionnaires were distributed, 19 to subject specialists, and one to a member of the Collection Development Committee who answered only those questions dealing with the Committee. Of the 20 questionnaires distributed, 18 were returned, for a 90% response rate. The results of this questionnaire form the basis for much of the discussion involving the subject specialist/liaison program, and for many of the general perceptions cited elsewhere. The comments from the questionnaire have been summarized to protect the confidentiality of the respondents; a summary of the results and comments is appended to this report (Appendix B).

Information in this report is current as of late Fall 1984. The Task Force has studied a dynamic organization, and some changes may have occurred since that time.

When referring to the existing Library structure, the title of "Head of Collection Development" is used. The title "Collection Development Officer" is used in the Task Force's recommendations. The two titles refer to the same essential function, but are used in this manner to reflect recommended changes in organizational structure of the collection development function.

Members of the Task Force were Carol Collier, Chair, Julie Davis, Martha Hanscom, Janet Hazelton, Linda Keiter, and Alice Marris. The charge to the Task Force is appended to this report (Appendix A).

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT: GENERAL OVERVIEW

The Collection Development Department consists presently of the Head of Collection Development, one half-time Library Clerk III, and several hourly clerical staff. It is administratively a unit of the Technical Services Division and its head reports to the the Associate Director for Technical Services.

Two subject specialist/liaisons, one responsible for fine arts, and the other for several disciplines in the sciences, have collection development as a major component in their jobs and spend substantial amounts of time working in the Collection Development Department, although neither currently reports directly to the Head of Collection Development. Part-time employees assigned to the department provide provide clerical support for these two subject specialists. Other subject specialist/liaisons have collection development as a much smaller component of their jobs, and have not generally had significant amounts of clerical support for these duties.

The Head of Collection Development is charged in his job description with writing and implementing the Library's collection development policy, reviewing and coordinating purchase requests, overseeing activities of the subject specialist/liaisons, overseeing evaluation of approval books, overseeing gift selection and disposition, reviewing requests for new exchanges, initiating and directing collection analyses, participating in development of allocation recommendations (as part of the now discharged Committee on Acquisitions and

Allocations), and serving as permanent chair of the Library's Collection Development Committee.

The Head of Collection Development, when interviewed by the Task Force, indicated that he perceives his role to be that of a coordinator of a diffused selection process. He indicated that the collection development program was not clearly defined by the former director at the time the department was created. He sees his priorities as: 1) spending acquisitions money intelligently; 2) controlling the growth of standing orders and periodicals; 3) analyzing the collection; and 4) evaluating gifts.

The Head of Collection Development has been responsible for training staff reporting directly to him and has done some training of the subject specialist/liaisons for their work on special projects. There are some written guidelines for liaison work with the academic departments, but the subject specialists have received little formal training in policies and procedures.

The Head of Collection Development was a member of the Committee on Acquisitions and Allocations which developed the allocations for the 1983-84 biennium, but has not otherwise taken a leading role in allocating the acquisitions budget.

ACQUISITIONS DEPARTMENT: GENERAL OVERVIEW

There are presently ten full-time equivalent positions in the Acquisitions Department, including the Head of Acquisitions, the

Acquisitions Manager and the staff of the ordering, receiving, accounting, and gifts and exchange sections. The department also relies on hourly workers to accomplish many of its basic tasks. The amount of this part-time assistance varies according to availability of funds.

The Head of Acquisitions is charged in his job description with coordinating and directing the work of the Acquisitions Department; recruiting and evaluating staff of the department; allocating and supervising expenditure of the book budget; compiling budget requests for the department; acquiring books and periodicals for the Library; conferring with faculty and students regarding future acquisitions; acquiring gifts and selling duplicates; coordinating acquisitions workflow with other Library departments; maintaining competence in recent technology in the area of technical services; conferring with faculty regarding the acquisitions budget; conferring with vendors and publishers; and appraising out-of-print books for the libraries of Wyoming.

The Acquisitions Manager reports directly to the Head of Acquisitions. This is a newly reclassified position which has been delegated much of the responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the department. There is uncertainty on the part of the Task Force as to the role of the Head of Acquisitions since the recent creation of the position of Acquisitions Manager.

The only other staff member reporting directly to the Head of Acquisitions is the gifts and exchange clerk, who reports to the Head

of Acquisitions for the half of her job which is allocated to gifts and exchanges, and to the head of the order unit for the half which is allocated to pre-order searching. All other staff report either directly to the Acquisitions Manager or to the various line supervisors in the department: the accounting technician, the head of the order unit, and the receiving clerks for monographs and approvals.

The role of the Acquisitions Department is generally perceived within the department as spending the acquisitions money by ordering and receiving materials and as accounting for the expenditure of funds. Persons outside the department who were interviewed were in general agreement with this view of what the role of the department should be.

There is a great deal of overlap at present between the Collection Development and Acquisitions Departments. This overlap centers on the roles of the heads of each department and on the gifts operations which are included in each department. Gifts and exchanges will be treated as a separate part of this report.

The Head of Acquisitions has frequent contacts with the teaching faculty, many of whom go directly to him with purchase requests rather than to the Head of Collection Development. The Head of Acquisitions currently takes the lead in recommending allocation of the acquisitions budget to internal and academic department accounts.

Interviews with department heads and questionnaire responses indicate that persons ouside the department are uncertain about how the

ordering process works. They are unsure how much information to fill in or not fill in on order cards; they are often unsure who to go to within the department for information on orders; they express frustration with lack of feedback on where an order is in the process, and with not being sure whether an item will come on approval or not. There is frustration both with the formatting of accounting reports and with the fact that reports are never up-to-date due to the off-line batch process which is currently being used.

Persons within the department also express frustration with people outside the department not having a sufficient understanding of acquisitions routines. There is a general perception that people outside the department should know more about the internal acquisitions routines than they do. The Head of Acquisitions seems to consider this less of a problem than others within the department do. It is generally conceded that the Library cannot expect academic department faculty to learn internal acquisitions department procedures. There is general agreement, however, both within and without the department, that subject selectors should know and follow correct procedures. No one has taken the lead to train selectors in procedures.

There is uncertainty both within the Library and on campus as to what types of materials and formats may be purchased with Library funds. There are at present no written guidelines for the Acquisitions staff to follow. There is demand on the campus for data-tapes, curriculum materials, films, videotapes, slides, and other types of information formats.

Orders are funneled into the Acquistions Department from teaching faculty and from various individuals within the Library. Most order cards which are sent initially to the Acquisitions Department are forwarded to the Collection Development Department for review before ordering. The Task Force is uncertain how much scrutiny these cards receive. Some orders, mainly from subject specialists, never go to the Collection Development Department before being processed through Acquisitions. Prior to Fall 1984, instructions distributed to the teaching faculty asked them to submit monograph orders directly to Acquisitions, while submitting serial requests to the Collection Development Department; these instructions were revised for Fall 1984, to request that all faculty orders be sent to the Collection Development Department. Faculty who have long been used to submitting orders directly to Acquisitions will probably continue to do so, at least for a while.

Orders from some Library or Library-affiliated units do not routinely go through the Collection Development Department, but go directly to Acquisitions. These units include Outreach and Audio-Visual Services.

Selection forms from approval plan vendors are distributed to subject specialist/liaisons by the Acquisitions staff, and those items which are selected for purchase by the subject specialists are returned to the approval vendors with directions to send the book.

Acquisitions staff are responsible for screening orders to avoid duplication. All staff members, except the accounting technician and

the department head, are involved in bibliographic verification at various stages in the acquisitions and receiving processes.

Orders which have been bibliographically searched and verified by the submitter usually proceed through the order unit more quickly than unverified orders. Though the department does not assign priorities to orders submitted by selectors, the fact that some orders require little additional verification leads to a situation in which some orders are expedited and de facto priorities are established. If orders are not well verified when they reach the department, there are delays in ordering due to the search process which they must go through. Additionally, some orders are held back on the assumption that they fit the approval profile and can be expected to arrive within a reasonable period from an approval vendor.

Screening for physical problems with materials is done by the receiving clerks. Any questions that arise regarding the acceptability of an item are referred to a supervisor, although who this supervisor may be will vary according to who is available at the time the question arises.

Acquisitions accounting is currently handled through the University's mainframe computers in a keypunched, batch processing mode. The accounting technician works with LARS (Library Acquisitions Reporting System), manual ledgers, and the University's FRS (Financial Recordkeeping System) to pay vendors and verify balances. The present system requires extensive manual recordkeeping and filing. The long term viability of the system is in serious doubt, as the University

seems committed to phasing out all keypunch operations. There has been some work done on planning and programming the conversion of LARS to an online system, but neither the Library nor the University has committed itself to going in this direction. There has been some investigation of turnkey acquisitions systems, including the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) acquisitions subsystem. Recently the Library has begun discussions with Brodart regarding development, using the Library as a pilot site, of an acquisitions system which would interface with the Brodart online catalog. Funding for an acquisitions system was requested in preliminary budget planning for the current biennium (1985-1986), but was cut from the final budget package by the University administration.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: GENERAL OVERVIEW

The Collection Development Committee was set up in mid-1979 around the time the Collection Development Department was separated from the Acquisitions Department. Its original purpose was to advise the Head of Collection Development on policy matters. The original members were appointed by the Director. The Head of Collection Development has served as the permanent chair of the Committee, and this duty is a formal part of his present job description.

The Collection Development Committee has been involved in some policy formulation, but much of what it has produced has never been ratified by the Administrative Council or Director. Much of its time during the last three years has been devoted to screening new serial

requests. This process was begun at a time when inflation of serial prices was running at the double-digit level and the Library had shifted serial subscriptions from departmental accounts to an internal account and was attempting to institute some control over the growth of the serials portion of the acquisitions budget.

For about two years, from 1981-1983, all new subscription requests were brought before the Committee for its recommendation. Recently, price guidelines for each discipline have been set up, and serials which fall within these guidelines may be approved by the subject specialists without going to the Collection Development Committee for review. The Committee still reviews requests for items which are expensive in relation to other materials in the discipline, or which present some problem for the selector.

The Collection Development Committee has been involved in some purchase requests for expensive non-serial items and collections, but this role has been inconsistent, as some extremely expensive purchases have never been considered by the Committee, and it has not been consistently involved in setting priorities among competing requests.

The Collection Development Committee has met on a fairly regular semi-monthly basis. The second meeting of the month has recently been designated as the regular meeting of the subject specialist/liaisons.

SUBJECT SPECIALIST/LIAISON PROGRAM: GENERAL OVERVIEW

The Library has recently instituted a program of assigning staff, mainly Library faculty, but also including some Library technicians working in reference areas, to do selection in designated subject areas and to serve as Library liaisons to the academic departments. The system has been in operation in the science branches for a longer period than at Coe.

There are currently 19 subject specialist/liaisons, drawn mainly from public services, but also from technical services, the Archives, and the Library administration. Subject specialist/liaison responsibilities are, for the most part, designated as a small percentage of an individual's job responsibilities, and have been added to already existing duties such as reference or cataloging. These responsibilities have been formally written into the job descriptions of most, but not all, subject specialist/liaisons.

Two short documents, "Guidelines for Liaison Work with Academic Departments" and "Subject Specialist's Job Duties" (both undated) have been reviewed and adopted by a joint meeting of the Collection Development Committee and the subject specialist/liaisons in April 1984. There remain vast differences in the level of activities, accomplishments and knowledge of the individual subject specialists. Some are actively working with the teaching faculty, while others feel uncomfortable with beginning their liaison duties until such time as they have been formally introduced to their assigned departments by

the Library administration. The levels of material selection activities are also very uneven, with one questionnaire respondent doing "all the buying for my department," while another has "no time to devote to selection." The most active subject specialist/liaisons are in the sciences and the fine arts, which are the only areas having individuals who are designated to spend at least 40% of their jobs on collection development.

Until recently there has been little training for the subject specialist/liaisons. Much of the training beyond the aforementioned documents has been verbal and directed towards accomplishing special projects, such as the Blackwell North America (B/NA) retrospective selections or the Books for College Libraries (BCL) project. Questionnaire responses indicate that there is general uncertainty among the subject specialist/liaisons as to what their specific responsibilities are, how they should go about accomplishing these responsibilities, and what their priorities should be. Procedures are not clear or are not understood by some subject specialists, and there is very little in writing to assist either the subject specialists or the acquisitions staff who must respond to subject specialist questions. Persons who have had collection development and subject specialist responsibilities over the last few years have learned many procedures on their own through trial and error or by asking the right questions, rather than through formal training, and have found ways to work within or around the existing systems. Many of the questionnaire respondents indicated a high level of frustration and confusion over

procedures. Some of the more experienced subject specialist/liaisons have taken the initiative to assist others by developing written guidelines and explanations of procedures. There is a strong feeling among questionnaire respondents that the Head of Collection Development ought to be taking the initiative to develop needed training and procedural materials.

Questionnaire responses indicate that many subject specialists feel that they do not have sufficient time, given competing demands of their jobs, to perform their subject specialist/liaison duties. Many indicate that lack of clerical support has been a problem. Only two of the subject selectors have had regularly assigned clerical assistants; most others have had none and there has never been enough part-time money available to provide each of the subject selectors with the level of support necessary to do an effective job. Concern with time and clerical support varies with the level of subject specialist responsibility and activity, and with individual knowledge and experience of what could be accomplished with adequate clerical support.

Many of the subject specialist/liaisons feel the information they are currently receiving regarding budgets, approval plan performance and the allocation process is inadequate. Most are aware of the current allocations for their areas of responsibility; however, many are not receiving acquisitions accounting reports on a regular basis.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT· GENERAL OVERVIEW

A portion of the acquisitions budget is subdivided into allocations assigned for support of the various academic departments. Faculty are encouraged to submit orders for materials in their areas of expertise, and these materials are charged to their departmental allocation. Many of the materials for which faculty orders are submitted are already arriving on approval, and those orders are returned to the department. Materials coming on approval are charged to the approval budget and are not taken out of departmental allocations. Some departments are finding that the approval plans cover most of their collection needs and they are not able to spend their allocations. Others are using allocations to buy retrospective materials not covered by the approval plans.

Faculty participation in building Library collections varies widely. Some are intensely interested in collecting in their areas; others are not involved at all.

Very little screening of faculty orders is presently done within the Library, although it is expected that the subject specialists will eventually take an active role in monitoring what materials are requested, and will be in regular contact with teaching faculty to learn their concerns with Library collections.

GIFTS AND EXCHANGES: GENERAL OVERVIEW

Gifts and exchanges are currently handled by personnel in two departments, Collection Development and Acquisitions. One full time

clerk in acquisitions devotes 50% of her time to gifts and exchanges, reporting to the Head of Acquisitions, and the other 50% in the pre-order search unit, reporting through the head of this unit to the Acquisitions Manager. There is also a half-time clerk in Collection Development who devotes perhaps half of her time to gifts. There is an informal division of the gifts and exchange duties of the two clerks, with the Collection Development clerk handling all monograph gifts and the Acquisitions clerk handling serial gifts and exchanges. There is overlap between the two jobs, which leads to some duplication of effort. An attempt has been made by the two incumbents to work out problems of overlap.

Historically, the gifts and exchange operations were handled by 1.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) clerks in the Acquisitions Department. This situation changed when Collection Development became a separate department in 1979, and changed further when the full time position was transferred from Collection Development to Acquisitions in 1980, while the half-time position remained attached to the Collection Development Department. The full-time Acquisitions Department position has since been split, so that the incumbent spends half-time on gifts and exchanges and the other half on pre-order searching.

It is unclear how many gifts the Library receives and processes each year or how many are actually kept. Estimates from those who work with gifts are that the Library receives 1500-2000 per year. One interviewee feels that about 35-40% are kept; another says it is nearer to 50%. There is currently a backlog of 4700 partially pro-

cessed gifts awaiting cataloging. In past years, many of the gifts which the Library received were materials acquired through the collection efforts of the American Heritage Center; inflow from this source has slowed somewhat since the reorganization of the Center's administrative structure.

There have been few solicited gifts in the past, although one major gift collection (2500 volumes) was solicited during the past year. The Head of Acquisitions has been involved in gift solicitation; the Head of Collection Development has not. Donors offering unsolicited gifts may be referred to either the Collection Development Department or Acquisitions, depending on their initial point of contact with the Library. Persons working within the Library are often unsure which of the two departments should be contacted. The Task Force has not discovered any written instructions or policy to guide Library staff in referring gift offers.

Exchange programs are most important in the field of geology, although exchanges exist in a variety of subject areas. There are currently about 2000 active exchanges. The Library has taken on responsibility for geology exchanges since the Wyoming Geological Survey was having difficulty keeping up with them. Geology exchanges are reviewed on a periodic basis by the Geology Library Manager; there does not appear to be any systematic review of other exchanges. The gifts and exchange clerk in Acquisitions is responsible for recordkeeping and claims for exchange items.

Incoming gifts may be examined by either the Head of Acquisitions or the Head of Collection Development, and their practices differ. One reviews gifts when they are offered; the other accepts all gifts and reviews them later. Subject specialists have not been extensively involved in gift screening until recently, when they reviewed backlogged gifts in the cage and on the 4th floor. Gifts which are to be reviewed after acceptance are screened by the gift clerks to weed out obviously inappropriate material and duplicates. There is a backlog in gift selection and in typing of order slips for the card catalog, so that some materials are currently in storage and have no point of access in the card catalog.

Special issues and other "extra" materials which come with memberships, subscriptions or blanket orders may also go through a similar selection process. These are usually reviewed by the Head of Collection Development.

Incoming gifts and exchanges which are part of active serials or periodicals are processed routinely and added to the collection. New exchange titles are sent to cataloging, and gifts which are to be kept and cataloged are sent to the cage for storage. Gifts are low on the list of cataloging priorities and are not routinely being cataloged at this time. Gifts which are not to be added to the collection are stored in the cage awaiting sale, either through the 25¢ table, or through the book auction. Income from the sales and auction amounts to about $2000 per year, and all the proceeds go into the book budget.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT: ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Strengths:

The Collection Development Department, as presently organized, has begun the process of analyzing the Library's collections, beginning with such significant efforts as the Books for College Libraries (BCL) and Sheehy projects. Little or no such analysis had been carried out prior to the creation of the Collection Development Department.

The Department has served as a clearinghouse for distributing requests for new serial subscriptions to the subject specialist/liaisons and has furnished the Acquisitions Department with current lists of subject selectors for approval form distribution.

Some training for the subject specialist/liaisons has been carried out by the Head of Collection Development, and recently he has arranged for key persons in the Acquisitions area to share information with the subject specialists. Regular meetings of all the subject specialist/liaisons are now held to update them on the collection development program and provide training in policies and procedures.

The Department has a small but well trained staff. Clerical support has been available to the two subject selectors who routinely spend significant time on collection development activities.

Weaknesses:

The role of the Collection Development Department has not been clearly defined by the Library administration. This problem dates

back to the creation of the department in 1979. There is substantial overlap between the work of the Head of Collection Development and the Head of Acquisitions.

It is generally perceived that the Head of Collection Development has not provided strong leadership in the shaping of collection policy. There has been little initiative shown by the incumbent in getting the subject specialist/liaison program started, training the subject specialists, developing short- and long-range plans for collection assessment and policy formulation, developing and justifying part-time funding requests to support the subject specialist/liaison program, or setting up effective communication channels with the subject specialists. Except for his membership on the committee which developed the allocations used during the 1983-1984 biennium, the Head of Collection Development has not been involved significantly in setting departmental and internal acquisition budget allocations. It is also generally perceived that the Library administration, sensing a lack of initiative on the part of the Head of Collection Development, has not always provided opportunities for this individual, but has worked around him. Lack of initiative on the one hand and of opportunity on the other have combined to make the collection development program less effective than it should be.

The Collection Development Department is currently placed within the Technical Services Division of the Library, although the subject specialist/liaisons are primarily drawn from the Public Services Division.

The Collection Development Department is responsible for selection and preliminary processing of monographic gifts. This is an area of overlap and confusion with the Acquisitions Department and is treated separately in this report.

There has been little structured monitoring of approval plan performance, a task which is perceived to be a function of the Collection Development Department. Neither are there any existing procedures for periodic review of blanket and standing orders and periodical subscriptions.

There is a general perception among those interviewed or responding to the questionnaire that purchase of expensive items is chaotic and lacks sufficient review by the Collection Development Department, the Collection Development Committee, and subject selectors. There is no central file of such requests maintained within the department, there has been no program of periodic review and ranking of such requests, and there are no established procedures for handling such requests. Unranked files of requests for expensive materials have instead been maintained within the Acquisitions Department. Availability of these materials from the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) has not been routinely considered when making purchase decisions.

It is generally perceived that the Head of Collection Development needs to develop better communication channels to the subject specialist/liaisons. Much generally applicable information regarding projects and procedures has been communicated orally on a one-to-one

basis. There is a need for more written communication to insure that all subject specialists are receiving the same information and instructions.

Recommendations:

1. The Library Director should, by July 1, 1985, clearly define expectations of the Library's collection development program. This should include a redefinition of the duties of the Head of Collection Development to specify responsibility for recommending allocations of the acquisitions budget; providing leadership in setting and documenting collection development policy; overseeing and guiding the subject specialist/liaison program, including development of procedural manuals and a training program; communicating with subject specialists, academic department faculty, and the Library administration; developing short- and long-range plans for collection assessment and policy formulation; developing and justifying part-time funding requests for collection development support; monitoring approval plan performance; periodically reviewing approval profiles, blanket and standing orders, and serials; setting up guidelines for gift and exchange selection; and maintaining a priority list of expensive item requests and checking these against CRL holdings.

2. The Collection Development Department should be redesignated by the Director as the Collection Development Office, and its head as the Collection Development Officer. The Collection

Development Officer should report to the Director at the Assistant Director level. This change should take place by July 1, 1985.

ACQUISITIONS DEPARTMENT: ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Strengths:

The doubling of the acquisitions budget in the 1983-1984 biennium, and the maintenance of that funding level in the present biennium, with no corresponding increase in staffing level, have placed a great deal of strain on the Department. While part-time funding has eased the situation somewhat, this funding has remained uncertain and nighly variable. The full-time staff has had to assume a greatly increased workload, and has managed to cope remarkably well with this situation. Most orders are processed with no problems. Approval plans have been successful in getting much of the material which is being requested into the Library without the necessity of producing individual orders.

There has been very little turnover in the full-time staff of the department, which has probably eased the pressures of the doubled budget. Key personnel within the department have held their positions for several years, thus having a great deal of experience in the various facets of acquisitions work. Training of new full-time staff has been at a minimum.

Weaknesses:

The increased workload is the most obvious problem with which the Acquisitions Department has had to cope. There was no increase in

staff when the budget was doubled. Acquisitions staff, when interviewed, indicated that increased pressure to push orders and receipts through the process, and to spend the money within inflexible state fiscal requirements, has led to more errors within the department. The pace of work has had to be accelerated, and there are fewer doublechecks than there previously were. Backlogs exist in processing selection forms from approval vendors. Accounting problems with vendors are not cleared up as rapidly as they should be due to the pressure to keep current with routine orders and receipts. Some staff members claim that there is a high level of stress within the department, due to the work load, and that this is affecting their physical health.

The lack of modern automated systems within the department is a problem, especially when combined with the increased workload. Ordering and receiving materials involves manually checking bibliographic sources and the card catalog. Order slips are typed and manually filed in departmental files and in the main card catalog. All accounting for orders and receipts requires keypunching, and accounting information is not available online. The low priority of the Library at the University computer center means that Library work sometimes gets backlogged, especially during registration periods and at the close of fiscal years. The accounting technician currently works with several different accounting systems instead of with one unified system, which makes it very difficult to achieve any degree of efficiency; the increased workload has tended to magnify pre-existing inefficiencies within the system.

Many of the persons interviewed by the Task Force perceive that the Acquisitions Department has not taken full advantage of the automated systems which are available, such as OCLC and the Brodart data base management system (DBMS), and that there is some resistance within the department to use these systems more fully. It is perceived that the Head of Acquisitions has not undertaken a detailed analysis of present systems to determine the full impact these various systems might have on departmental operations.

It is also commonly perceived by those outside the department that the Head of Acquisitions, although he has been involved in the development of the OCLC acquisitions subsystem, has not pushed as hard as he might have for automated systems for the department, and may not have presented a sufficiently well-documented case for further automation to the Library and University administrations. It is also questioned how much support an automated acquisitions system has received from the Library and University administrations. A request for funding was included in the Library's budget submission for the 1985-86 biennium, but was cut from the request at the University level. The Task Force notes that two other systems, LINX serials check-in and the Brodart database management system, which were not specifically budgeted for 1983-1984, have been funded from internal or contractural accounts. It is perceived that the Library administration can often find ways of funding new programs if it is convinced of their value.

Many of those interviewed and surveyed by the Task Force feel that there is a problem of communication between the department and those

outside the department who must deal with it on a routine basis. Persons within the department complain that those outside the department don't have sufficient knowledge of departmental procedures, and thus make their work more difficult. Persons outside the department, on the other hand, note that Acquisitions staff has not, until very recently, attempted to explain policies, procedures, or forms to the subject specialist/liaisons. There is mutual frustration, and no one has taken the initiative to attempt to alleviate these difficulties.

There is a great deal of frustation expressed by the subject specialist/liaisons and reference department heads that they get no routine feedback from the Acquisitions Department on the status of orders. Acquisitions staff does not have time to provide feedback except when specifically requested on an individual item. This situation is unlikely to change without automation of acquisitions records. There are recurring complaints that some orders disappear after being submitted to the department and must be resubmitted. There is concern among the subject specialist/liaisons that they are not always sure who to approach within the department regarding specific problems. The list of contact people within the department which was recently issued to subject specialist/liaisons should help alleviate this problem.

Many of those interviewed felt that there was a reluctance on the part of the department head to deal with recurring problems in a systematic way. There is a perception that problems are dealt with on a case-by-case, individual basis, even though the same problem may be

repeated, and may indicate some general weakness either with a routine or with an individual's performance, which could be corrected either through adjusting the system, training of individuals, or disciplinary actions.

Recommendations:

3. The Library Director should, by July 1, 1985, examine the existing job responsibilities of the Head of Acquisitions, and should redefine them as necessary to eliminate existing overlap with the duties of the Collection Development Officer and the Acquisitions Manager. The Head of Acquisitions should be responsible for analyzing departmental systems and routines, making changes as necessary for improved operations; monitoring the expenditure of the acquisitions budget; providing accounting information to the Collection Development Officer, the subject specialist/liaisons, and the Library administration as necessary; cooperating with the Collection Development Officer in developing written guidelines and policy statements for the subject specialist/liaisons; investigating possibilities for automating acquisitions systems and routines, recommending a future course of action, and implementing such a system; reviewing personnel and budget requests which have been developed by the Acquisitions Manager; dealing with vendors regarding discounts, bonuses, or non-routine problems; establishing routines for processing gifts and exchanges; and setting priorities and goals for the department.

4. The Head of Acquisitions should actively investigate opportunities for upgrading the existing LARS accounting system or for replacing it with a leased or purchased system, and should recommend by December 1, 1985, a future course of action based on this investigation.

5. The Head of Acquisitions should, in consultation with the Collection Development Officer, develop and implement, by October 1, 1985, a plan forimproving communication between the Acquisitions Department and the subject specialist/liaisons and reference personnel. This should include written guidelines on ordering procedures and policies, and up-to-date information on which department staff handle which types of problems.

6. The Head of Acquisitions and the Acquisitions Manager should, by October 1, 1985, investigate recurring problems with existing routines or personnel, and make adjustments as necessary to correct these problems, either through changes in routines or through personnel actions. Performance standards should be set for departmental personnel, and they should be evaluated on their effectiveness in meeting these standards.

7. The Head of Acquisitions should, by July 1, 1985, investigate possibilities for taking better advantage of existing automated systems, such as OCLC and the Brodart DBMS. This should include discussions with the Head of Cataloging, and might require flexibility in scheduling of personnel within both departments to take full advantage of the available terminals.

8. The Director, in consultation with the Head of Acquisitions, should investigate the possible advantages of bringing in an outside consultant who would analyze departmental systems and make recommendations for improvements which could benefit the Library. This could be especially useful as the Department moves towards further automation of its routines, and should be done by December 1, 1985, before a recommendation on an automated system is made.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Strengths:

The Collection Development Committee has served as a needed mechanism for discussion of Library-wide collection policy, for balancing serial requests from various departments, and for screening some of the expensive item requests and collection purchase decisions.

It is generally perceived by those responding to the subject specialist/liaison survey, and those interviewed by the Task Force, that the Collection Development Committee should continue to exist, and should play a key role in guiding the development of the Library's collections. There is general agreement that there needs to be some sounding board for policy recommendations, setting collection priorities, reviewing expensive purchase requests, and recommending allocation of the acquisitions budget.

Weaknesses:

It is generally perceived that the Collection Development Committee as it presently exists and functions is not very effective.

Questionnaire responses indicated that the role and functions of the Collection Development Committee are not clearly understood. The Task Force could not locate any charge to the Committee from the former Director who created it. Its original purpose is assumed to be that of advising the Head of Collection Development on policies and goals of the collection development program. However, it currently spends much of its time and effort on reviewing serial requests rather than on dealing with policies and goals.

It is unclear how much influence and power the Committee has in setting collection policy. Acceptance of those policies which it has drafted and submitted to the Director for final approval has been delayed pending recommendations of the Collection Analysis Project. Though they are being used as interim guidelines, these policies have not been drafted to any standard of content or style, and have sometimes included items which are outside the assumed authority of the Committee.

The composition of the Collection Development Committee was clearly defined at its inception, but has since become very unclear. No new or replacement members have been formally appointed by the Director for some time, although new people have assumed places on the Committee and regularly attend meetings and participate in delibera-

tions. As many as a dozen persons have sat on the Committee at times, and this seems an inefficient use of personnel time. A number of respondents to the survey felt that a smaller, better defined membership would be more efficient and effective.

It is generally perceived by interviewees and questionnaire respondents that the effectiveness of the Collection Development Committee has been hampered by a lack of strong leadership and direction. Meetings are usually held on a regular schedule, whether there is any pressing reason to meet or not. There is frequently no announced agenda, although there has been for recent meetings. Many meetings in the past have consisted mainly of tasks, such as distributing serial requests to selectors, which could have been accomplished more efficiently through other means. It is generally perceived that the Committee gets bogged down in petty details, and does not spend sufficient time and effort in discussing and defining broad collection policies and priorities. The Committee has not been heavily involved in recommending allocation of the acquisitions budget. It has been consulted on some expensive purchase requests, but many such requests have not been presented to the Committee. It has not consistently been involved in setting priorities among competing expensive requests.

Recommendations:

9. The Collection Development Committee should continue to exist as a forum for discussing and developing collection policies and

priorities, for setting priorities for expensive purchase requests, and for advising the Collection Development Officer in the development of allocation recommendations. The Director should, by July 15, 1985, write a charge to the Committee clearly outlining its functions, authority, and performance expectations.

10. The Director should, in his charge, clearly define the size and composition of the Committee. It should be a smaller committee than at present. Terms of membership should be clearly defined and provisions outlined for rotating members and for filling vacancies.

11. The Director should appoint, by July 15, 1985, the chair of the Committee. The Collection Development Officer should serve as a permanent ex officio member of the CoOmmittee.

SUBJECT SPECIALIST/LIAISON PROGRAM: ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Strengths:

The subject specialist/liaison program, while still relatively new and uneven in its implementation, allows the Library to take advantage of the subject area expertise of the participants to build collections and establish communication with the academic departments regarding their library needs and expectations. Several of the subject specialist/liaisons have been very active in working with their departments, and in assessing and building collections. Supervisory support for participation in the program is extremely strong.

The subject specialist/liaison program draws participants chiefly from the Public Services Division, where staff are in a position to gather firsthand experience of patron demands. At the same time, by not limiting the subject specialist/liaisons to the public service units, the program takes advantage of the expertise of staff working in other areas of the Library. Participants include Library faculty and technicians.

The subject specialists have successfully undertaken work on several special projects: BCL retrospective purchases, the B/NA retrospective project, and the partial weeding of the Dewey collection.

Weaknesses:

Responses to the survey of subject specialist/liaisons, and interviews with selected department heads and administrators indicate that there are some serious problems with the program as it is presently being implemented. These include training, definition of duties and authority, time commitments of competing duties, and lack of adequate clerical support.

There is a general perception that training of subject specialist/liaisons has been inadequate. Many feel that there has not been sufficient clarification of what is expected of them and how they should go about achieving those expectations. Subject specialists have undertaken their duties from different levels of knowledge of systems and procedures. Some have displayed a reluctance to become

heavily committed to the program until they have a better understanding of what the expectations are. While a written outline of subject specialist duties does exist, many of the detailed instructions for carrying out these duties have been verbal. Individual subject specialists have sought out instructions on an ad hoc basis, and have at times taken it upon themselves to develop written guidelines for all of the subject specialists. Several questionnaire respondents have indicated the need for a formal training program and a manual of practices and procedures. Interviews with Acquisitions staff also indicate that better training of subject specialists would be helpful ooth to the selectors and to technical services staff. It is generally agreed that the Head of Collection Development should have primary responsibility for developing a training program and a manual of policies and procedures.

Fifty-nine percent of the questionnaire responses indicated that procedures need to be more clearly defined. It has been left to the individual subject specialists to find out what procedures to follow. There has been little organized effort to see that all subject selectors are getting the same information and instructions. Both subject selectors and technical services personnel would benefit from standardization of procedures.

It is generally perceived that the duties and authority of the subject specialist/liaisons need to be better defined. A majority of the questionnaire responses indicated a need for a specific and comprehensive understanding of subject specialist duties and authority

to develop collections in their assigned areas of responsibility, including specifically what authority they have to obligate funds allocated to academic departments.

Half of the questionnaire respondents felt that they needed more time to do an effective job on their subject specialist/liaison duties. These duties have generally been added onto other assignments, such as scheduled reference desk duties. There is a general perception that spending more time and effort on collection development would cause slippage in other areas of the job.

There are two major problems with clerical support for the subject specialist/liaison program at present. First, support is inadequate, especially if the Library intends to pursue a vigorous program of collection assessment and collection building. Second, existing clerical support is distributed very unevenly, with two selectors getting the bulk of the available part-time hours and most selectors getting no assistance.

There is confusion among the subject specialist/liaisons over who they should consult in the event of a problem with their subject specialist duties. Questionnaire responses listed ten different positions or individuals who might be contacted regarding such problems. Part of the confusion is attributable to the overlap in duties between the Head of Collection Development and the Head of Acquisitions.

Recommendations:

12. The Director, in consultation with the Collection Development Officer, should, by October 1, 1985, redefine and clarify the duties, expectations, and authority for expending acquisitions funds of the subject specialist/liaisons.

13. The Collection Development Officer, in cooperation with key personnel in the Acquisitions Department, should, by October 1, 1985, develop a written plan for developing policy and procedural guidelines and examples for the subject specialist/liaisons. Provisions should be outlined for updating these materials on a continuing basis.

14. The Collection Development Officer, in cooperation with key personnel in the Acquisitions Department, should, by October 1, 1985, develop and institute a training program for subject specialist/liaisons. All existing subject specialist/liaisons should participate in this program, and plans should be instituted for routinely training new personnel as they enter the program.

15. The Director should, by July 1985, clarify through adjustments to position descriptions of the Collection Development Officer, the Head of Acquisitions, and the various subject specialist/liaisons, the reporting relationships of all persons involved in the collection development process.

16. The Director, Collection Development Officer, and applicable department heads should, by December 1, 1985, review position descriptions of all participants in the subject specialist/liaison program, and should include provisions for this duty in those job descriptions which do not already contain such provisions. Job descriptions should indicate an expected percentage of time to be spent on collection development activities.

17. The Collection Development Officer should, by September 1, 1985, develop a plan for providing a pool of part-time clerical assistants for use by the subject specialist/liaisons in performing their collection development duties. Assistance should be made available to all subject specialists, with provisions for priorities for such assistance based on changing collection development needs.

18. The Library administration should, by October 1, 1985, formally announce the subject specialist/liaison program to the academic departments, outlining to them the role of the various participants in the collection development process.

19. The Collection Development Officer should, by February 1986, develop and implement a plan for routinely involving the subject specialist/liaisons in the annual allocation process.

20. The Collection Development Officer should, by October 1985, develop and implement plans for routinely providing subject specialist/liaisons with management information, including appro-

val plan profiles, accounting information, and call number breakdowns for serials and approval purchases.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT: ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Strengths:

Involvement of teaching and research faculty in the collection development process provides the Library with subject expertise which it otherwise would not have. Faculty participation is essential in helping to identify materials which are needed to support the academic curriculum and research projects.

Weaknesses:

There is great variation in faculty participation in collection building. Even in disciplines where library use is substantial, some faculty are far more interested in Library holdings than are others.

Some faculty tend to build collections in their areas of personal interest and expertise. This can lead to strong collections in narrow subject areas, but there is always a danger that more general collection needs will be not be addressed. The Library must actively work to insure that collections meet the needs of the total user community by assessing collections and ordering materials to supplement those requested by faculty.

Recommendations:

21. The Director should reaffirm to the teaching faculty that their input on purchase decisions is a vital part of the collection development process, and should encourage submission of requests for library materials in their areas of expertise.

22. Subject specialist/liaisons should, by October 1, 1985, develop and maintain regular contacts with faculty in their areas of responsibility, so that they are familiar with the teaching and research needs of the academic departments, and so that they may consider these needs when making purchase recommendations.

GIFTS AND EXCHANGES: ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Strengths:

The gifts and exchange operation brings some materials into the Library which would be otherwise unavailable. This is especially true of the Geology exchanges. The Library also manages to acquire some useful but out-of-print materials from incoming gifts. There is a perception that good will towards the Library is generated by the sale of unwanted gift materials.

Weaknesses:

The split structure of the gifts and exchange operation leads to confusion and inefficiency. Part-time clerks in two departments are processing materials. Both the Head of Collection Development and the

Head of Acquisitions accept and review gift materials. Other Library staff members are unsure who is responsible for which phase of gift and exchange operations, so materials are sometimes sent to the wrong person. Work may be duplicated. The clerk in the Collection Development Department sometimes receives instructions from the Head of Acquisitions as well as from her own supervisor. The two clerks try to cooperate with each other, but they are both loyal to their individual supervisors and are somewhat territorial about their work. The gifts and exchange clerk in Acquisitions is the only staff member other than the manager who reports directly to the Head of Acquisitions.

There are no policies and few documented procedures for handling gifts and exchanges. Responsibility for selecting gifts is split between two departments. Subject specialist/liaisons are not routinely involved in reviewing incoming gifts in their area of responsibility. There are no guidelines for accepting or rejecting gift materials. There is no centralized location where gifts are accepted. Some gift offers are screened before being accepted; others are screened only after they are in the Library's possession. Some gifts, mainly donations to the American Heritage Center, have been accepted with restrictions, and a few have been returned to the donor because the Library had not secured unrestricted title to the materials. Some gifts may have been accepted more on the basis of political expediency than on Library collection needs.

The Library has solicited some gift collections, but there are no

guidelines on what types of collections should be solicited, and who should be responsible for this aspect of collection development.

In response to the large cataloging backlog, gifts were sorted into a separate backlog and assigned a low priority for cataloging. Currently they are not being cataloged at all, except by special request, and this policy is not likely to change within the next several years. There are temporary slips in the main card catalog, and the backlog is organized by a temporary accession number so that materials may be located. No one is satisfied with the moratorium on gift cataloging, but it is generally felt within the Library that purchased materials should receive higher cataloging priority than gifts.

Gift materials which are not selected for cataloging into the Library's collection are sold, either on regular sale tables, or at an auction which is held annually. Preparation for the auction and keeping sale tables full consumes valuable staff time. The income from the auction and sales is less than $2000 a year, which is deposited into the book budget and used to buy items for exchanges and to replace lost or worn items. Books awaiting sale take up substantial storage space which might be better used for other purposes. Income from sales probably does not offset the costs to the Library in staff time and lost storage space.

Some materials are treated as gifts although they really are not. Prominent among these items are Wyoming documents, which are sent to the Library by statute, and not as gifts. Certain other materials,

such as supplements to serials, and materials which come as part of memberships may be reviewed in the same manner as gifts even though technically they are not gifts.

Recommendations:

23. The Director should redefine the administrative structure of gifts and exchange processing operations by consolidating them in one department, logically the Acquisitions Department. Changes should be implemented by July 1, 1986. The gifts and exchange clerk should be responsible for pre-selection bibliographic searching, typing temporary slips for the card catalog, claiming exchanges which haven't arrived on schedule, preparing incoming gift materials for review by subject specialist/liaisons, and arranging for storage of selected gifts awaiting cataloging. All actual selection decisions should be made by subject specialists.

24. The Collection Development Officer should, by November 1, 1985, develop written guidelines for accepting gift materials. These should be in accordance with collection development policies for subject collections. Whenever possible, donations should be screened before acceptance, to reduce the number of unprocessed gift materials which must be stored in the Library.

25. The Collection Development Officer, or designated subject selectors, should be the primary contact for donations. This change should take place by July 1, 1985.

26. Nothing, except at the discretion of the Director, should be accepted with moral or legal restrictions, and a policy should be devoloped stating this principal. The Library should retain the right to sell or otherwise dispose of gift materials which it chooses not to add to the collections.

27. Exchanges should be established and reviewed regularly in accordance with collection development policies for the applicable subject area. The subject specialist/liaison for the subject area should be responsible for recommending establishment of any exchanges for the area. Procedures should be the same as for establishing new periodical subscriptions, since both require an on-going commitment of time and money. Policies should be written, by November 1, 1985, which state explicitly the responsibilities and relationships of the Library and campus publishers.

28. The Library should solicit gifts that will enhance the Library's collections, in accordance with established subject collection policies. The Collection Development Officer, in consultation with appropriate subject specialist/liaisons, should be designated authority to solicit gifts. This delegation of authority should take effect July 1, 1985.

29. Gifts currently awaiting cataloging should, by November 1, 1985, be screened by subject selectors, and if they are deemed worthy of inclusion in the collection, should be integrated into the cataloging flow. Retention decisions should be made in accordance with established collection policies.

30. The Director should, by October 1, 1985, reassess the current practice of selling and auctioning unwanted gift materials, taking into consideration staff time expended on sales, storage space sacrificed for these materials, income from sales, and goodwill generated by sales. He should make a recommendation whether to continue future sales.

31. Wyoming documents should not be treated as gifts, since they are obtained through statutory deposit. They deserve a separate study. Other materials not specifically ordered should be reviewed in the same manner as gifts by the appropriate subject specialist/liaisons.

APPENDIX A

CHARGE FOR THE TASK FORCE ON ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

1. The Task Force should examine the present organizational relationships of the collection development process. Is the present organizational pattern working effectively? Are changes needed? Specific attention should be given to:

   a. The role and responsibilities of the Collection Development Department
   b. The role and responsibilities of the Collection Development Committee
   c. The role and responsibilities of the subject specialist/departmental liaisons
   d. The role and responsibilities of the teaching and research faculty
   e. The role and responsibilities of the Acquisitions Department
   f. Identification of areas of overlapping or undefined responsibility
   g. Examination of goals and objectives for collection development, both written and unwritten
   h. Examination of communication patterns and mechanisms between and among groups involved in collection development activities
   i. Distribution of accountability within the collection development process

2. The Task Force should examine existing staffing patterns of collection development and acquisitions functions and analyze their effectiveness. Is the existing system working as well as it might? Are changes needed? Specific attention should be given to:

   a. The process for selecting and appointing subject specialist/departmental liaisons
   b. The process of training subject specialists for collection development duties
   c. The existing mechanisms for monitoring the performance of subject specialists
   d. The effectiveness of dual reporting relationships for the subject specialists
   e. The staffing patterns and training programs of the Aquisitions Department

3. The Task Force should examine materials selection practices and procedures of collection development. How effective are these? Are changes needed? Specific attention should be given to:

a. The adequacy of existing written procedural materials
b. The flow of paperwork from initial selection through receipt in Acquisitions
c. The effectiveness of the current approval plans in meeting collection goals
d. The availability and adequacy of management information, both internally generated and supplied by vendors
e. The criteria used in setting up approval profiles and for approving individual orders
f. The process of screening and ranking of priorities for purchase of materials, both expensive and inexpensive
g. The existing feedback mechanisms to subject selectors and teaching faculty
h The gifts and exchange operation, including selection and processing of materials.

4. In light of the above examinations, the Task Force should assess the current strengths and weaknesses of collection development organization, staffing and procedures and should formulate workable recommendations for changes which could inprove the process.

5. The Task Force should prepare written objectives for the collection development process.

6. The Task Force should prepare a detailed written report of its analyses and recommendations for change and submit it to the Study Team by October 1, 1984.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF SUBJECT SPECIALIST/LIAISONS

SUMMARY RESULTS

Note: The Task Force on Organization and Staffing, in conjunction with the Task Force on Allocations Practices, surveyed the subject specialist/liaisons (SS/Ls) to gather perceptions on the effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses of the present subject specialist/liaison program, adequacy of management information currently available for collection development purposes, and the effectiveness and role of the Collection Development Committee. Twenty questionnaires were distributed, 19 to subject specialists, and one to a member of the Collection Development Committee who answered only those questions dealing with the Committee. Of the 20 questionnaires distributed, 18 were returned, for a 90% response rate. The results of this questionnaire form the basis for much of the discussion of the subject specialist/liaison program and for many of the general perceptions cited in the body of the Task Force report.

This appendix presents the results of the questionnaire responses. The responses do not always equal the number of questionnaires returned, since some respondents checked more than one response on some questions, and some did not answer all questions.

Numerous comments were written on the returned questionnaires. These have not been transcribed verbatim, but have been summarized to protect the confidentiality of the respondents. Questionnaires were returned and responses tabulated in August 1984.

QUESTIONS AND SUMMARY RESPONSES:

1. How did you become a designated subject specialist/liaison?

   a. 5 Answered a survey from the Collection Development Department

   b. 10 Part of your job description

   c. 4 Other (please explain)

2. Why did you become a subject specialist/liaison?

Most respondents see a need for the program.
Most feel they can contribute in positive manner.
Most have a subject background and wish to make use of it.

3. How comfortable do you feel doing selection in your field?

Very comfortable	1	2	3	4	5	Very uncomfortable
	(3)	(8)	(3)	(1)	(1)	

Please explain:
Most feel quite comfortable with their field; most feel they have adequate background/familiarity with the subject matter.

4. How were you informed that you had been selected as a subject specialist for your field?

a. 3 Letter

b. 12 Verbally

c. 4 Other (please explain) (2 "other" also answered letter/verbally)

Most SS/Ls have had no formal written confirmation of these duties.

5. Training:

a. What training did you receive for your subject specialist/liaison duties:

Most received little or no training.
Training has been mostly verbal.
Training has often been given only in response to SS/L requests.
Some training has been provided for specific projects (BCL, Dewey weeding).

b. Were your duties clearly defined?

Clearly defined:	1	2	3	4	5	Not defined
	(0)	(2)	(6)	(8)	(1)	

Please explain:
53% felt duties were not defined or unclearly defined. SS/Ls generally want more comprehensive training. Many feel that only small parts of SS/L job have been defined - ex: BNA slips

c. Were procedures clearly defined?

Clearly defined: 1 (0) 2 (1) 3 (6) 4 (6) 5 (4) Not defined

Please explain:
Many feel there is no clearly defined program for teaching procedures; learning procedures is largely an individual effort.

d. If procedures were explained to you, how were they explained?

8 Written guidelines and instructions

13 Verbal guidelines and instructions

7 Both written and verbal

Comments:
SS/Ls indicate a need for written examples and guidelines.

e. Who would you to if a problem arose regarding your subject specialist/lisison duties?

Paul Cors	Keith Cottam	Linda Keiter
Henry Yaple	Joanne Bessler	Bill Stewart
Deborah Dawson	Bill Van Arsdale	Direct Supervisor

Other Subject Specialist/liaisons

Comments: Diversity of answers indicates a need for clarification of individual roles.

f. Are you aware of what selection materials are available in your field?

Yes = 7; another 6 fairly confident

Most SS/Ls feel that they know their field well enough to do selection.

g. Do you have any suggestions for improving the training of subject specialist/liaisons?

Suggestions included formal training, written policies, guidelines, workshops, sample forms, written explanations, procedures manual.

6. What actions do you feel a subject specialist/liaison ought to be taking to build collections?

Responses included contact with academic departments;

looking at journals in field; monitoring spending of money; assessing collections; developing policies; monitoring academic and research programs

7. Do you feel that the subject specialist/liaison porgram is working effectively in your area?

Very effectively 1 (2) 2 (5) 3 (3) 4 (5) 5 (2) Not working effectively

Please explain:

Equally divided between those who feel program is working effectively and those who feel it is not. Respondents mention lack of time, unsureness as to what their role and authority are.

8. a. Do you feel you have enough time to perform your subject specialist/liaison duties?

6 Yes 7 No

Other responses: yes/no-1; yes/maybe-1; probably-1; can't answer-1

Half feel they need more time for SS/L duties.

b. If no, how much time do you feel you need?

Varies widely, partially because of uneven division of responsibilities. Range: 1-20 hours per week.

c. Do you have ideas on how you could get more time?

Not do something else; get more staff so that responsibilities could be redistributed; get more clerical assistance

d. Are there things which would not get done if you spent more time on collection development? (Please specify)

Most would have to let some other duty slide - reference, administrative duties.

9. Supervision:

a. Do you feel that your primary supervisor is supportive of your subject specialist/liaison duties?

Very supportive: 1 (14) 2 (2) 3 (1) 4 (0) 5 (0) Not supportive

Please explain:

Support from direct supervisors is not a problem.

b. Are there any problems in reporting to your supervisor and the Collection Development Officer for different parts of your job?

2 Yes 11 No yes/no-1 other-3

If yes, please explain:

There is really very little reporting to the Collection Development Officer.

10. Are you getting adequate clerical support to carry out your subject specialist/liaison duties? (e.g.: typing orders, checking bibliographies, checking card catalog, etc.)

Completely adequate:	1	2	3	4	5	Inadequate
	(2)	(3)	(5)	(2)	(5)	

If not completely adequate, how much clerical support do you feel you need?

Varies, depending on how involved the respondent is in SS/L activities, and by the level of their knowledge of what could or ought to be accomplished with support.

11. Please indicate the level of contact you have had with the academic department(s) for which you are responsible:

Visited department; actively working with the faculty:	1	2	3	4	5	No visit to department; not actively working with the faculty
	(2)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(5)	

Please explain:

Contact level varies from active working relationships to no contact. Some SS/Ls feel a need for an introduction from the Library administration before establishing contact.

12. Acquistions funds are presently allocated to academic departments.

a. Do you know how much money is allocated to the department(s) for which you are responsible?

13 Yes 4 No

Comments:

SS/Ls have no great problem in finding out what the figures are.

b. Do you understand how allocation amounts are determined?

Clearly understand the process:	1	2	3	4	5	No understanding of the process
	(1)	(1)	(8)	(5)	(2)	

Please explain:

The process is not very clear to most SS/Ls.

c. Do you feel that you have sufficient opportunity for input into the allocation process?

Sufficient:	1	2	3	4	5	Insufficient
	(3)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(3)	

Please explain:

SS/Ls feel they should have been contacted earlier in the process.

d. Do you receive adequate information about departmental obligations and expenditures of allocations to effectively carry out your duties as a liaison?

Completely adequate:	1	2	3	4	5	Inadequate
	(2)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(5)	

Please explain:

SS/Ls are receiving reports only if they ask; they want information on materials in process or not yet ordered.

e. If you feel that presently available information is inadequate, please indicate what information you would find useful:

Timely reports of obligations and expenditures in process; many would like just to know what is available, then they would have a better idea of what is useful; they would like price/output/approval plan coverage and call number information.

13. The Library currently participates in several approval plans: Blackwell North America, Academic Book Center, and Majors Scientific Books.

a. Are you familiar with the approval profiles for materials in your subject areas?

Very familiar:	1	2	3	4	5	No knowledge
	(3)	(6)	(2)	(3)	(3)	

Comments:

Most SS/L's feel they know the approval profile in their areas.

b. Do you know what categories of materials are coming on approval in your area?

6 Yes 3 No 8 Unsure

Please explain:

Responses indicate discrepancy with answers to 13a.

c. Do you feel that adjustments should be made to the approval profiles for materials in your area?

1 Yes 5 No 9 Need more info on present profile

Please explain:

There is a strong feeling that we do not know enough about the performance of the present plan to judge whether adjustments are necessary.

d. What information regarding approval plans would you find useful?

Written explanation of the profiles; history of various approval plans; evaluation; call number listing; price information; current publisher list.

e. What do you feel are the strengths of the present approval plans?

They cover most pertinent titles for current material; cut down on individual orders; allow Library to spend

money easily; save time; give Library greater control over expenditures.

f. What do you feel are the weaknesses of the present approval plans?

Some things are missed; SS/Ls are never sure whether an item will be received and are never sure whether to order or not; faculty are still confused over what will come on approval.

14. Acquisitions accounting:

a. Are you currently receiving copies of the Library Acquisition Records System (LARS) printouts for your area of responsibility?

6 Yes 11 No

b. If no, are you aware that the printouts are available to you?

6 Yes 7 No
(includes 2 who answered yes to 14a)

Most SS/Ls who are not getting printouts were not aware they were available.

c. Do you understand what information the printouts include or don't include?

Good understanding	1	2	3	4	5	Poor
	(2)	(0)	(9)	(2)	(3)	understanding

Please comment:

Many SS/Ls are unsure of what is included on the printouts and would welcome an explanation or workshop.

d. Do you have a clear understanding of how to read the printouts?

Clear understanding	1	2	3	4	5	Poor
	(3)	(1)	(5)	(4)	(3)	understanding

Please comment: (No comments received)

e. Are there any changes in the printouts which you would find useful: Please explain.

Time lines; clear definition of terminology; listing of approval and standing order information; purging of extremely old information.

15. Information needs:

a. Are you getting adequate information to effectively carry out your subject specialist/liaison duties?

7 Yes 10 No

If no, what information do you need, and who could or should supply it?

Training should be provided by the Collection Development Officer.
Information on what's been ordered or is coming on approval should be provided by the Acquisitions Department.
Up-to-date information on expenditures of allocations should be provided by the Acquisitions Department.
Information on policies and procedures should be a joint responsibility of the Collection Development Officer and the Head of Acquisitions.

b. Do you have enough information about teaching and research programs in your area of responsibility?

6 Yes 10 No Yes/No - 1

Please explain:

SS/Ls indicate a need to talk to faculty, and to review available information.

c. Are the selection and review media you need to do an effective job being sent or routed to you on a regular basis? (ex: library periodicals, Choice cards, journals in your subject, etc.)

Everything needed is sent or routed	1	2	3	4	5	Nothing is being sent or routed
	(2)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(5)	

Please explain:

Choice cards are not being routed; library periodicals are routed slowly; non-library periodicals are not routed at all.

d. Is there information which vendors such as B/NA and Faxon should be able to supply which you would find useful?

9 Yes 2 No

Please explain:

Price and output information; people don't have a clear idea of what information could be made available; call number information.

e. Are the procedures for supplying you with information working?

Working well 1 (1) 2 (3) 3 (4) 4 (3) 5 (4) Not working at all

Unsure -1

Please explain:

Information is not being supplied routinely; people feel they have to seek it out.

f. Is there additional information which would be useful to you in carrying out your duties?

11 Yes 1 No Not enough info to answer - 1
Probably - 1

If yes, please explain:

SS/Ls see need for guidelines on what they should be doing, outline of the purpose of the program, explanation of procedures, a statement of goals, and feedback.

g. What could be done to make currently available information more useful?

Explanation of what is available; more systematic methods of transferring information; better organization of information.

16. Subject specialist/liaison program:

a. What do you feel are the strengths of the present subject specialist/liaison program?

Involvement of Library staff with subject expertise; more working involvement with faculty, better monitoring of teaching and research needs; acquisitions money should be better spent.

b What do you feel are the weaknesses of the present program?

Lack of information, lack or organization, lack of adequate time, lack of part-time or clerical support, lack of training and guidance; unevenness of responsibility of various SS/Ls, lack of leadership, lack of program evaluation

c. What suggestions do you have for improving the program?

Clearer description of duties; training; the Collection Development Officer should take a more active role; time; clerical assistance; organization; written guidelines.

17. What things could the Library do to help you carry out your subject specialist/liaison duties?

15 Contact academic departments with official lettter of introduction

12 Publicize program in campus media

15 Provide clerical support

8 Provide release time for departmental visits and in-library work

13 Put these duties in job descriptions

6 Other

Provide training; have better organization of the program.

18. The Library currently has a Collection Development Officer, a Collection Development Committee, and a subject specialist/liaison program.

a. What role should the Collection Development Committee play in the collection development process?

Draft preliminary allocation figures.
Advise the Collection Development Officer on policy, planning, and priorities.
Review expensive purchases.
Review policies.

b. Is the Collection Development Committee currently doing the things which you would expect such a committee to be doing?

If yes, do you have any suggestions for making the committee more effective?

Clarify its role and functions.
Involve it more in policy formulation and planning.
Clarify its membership and make it smaller.
Set agendas for its meetings.
The Committee needs more effective leadership.

d. Should the composition of the Collection Development Committee remain as it is?

6 SS/Ls answered they didn't know the present composition.
Others felt it should be smaller and more representative.

19. Please give us any other comments you may have on the collection development program, the Collection Development Committee, and the subject specialist/liaison program.

Collection Development program needs better planning, organization, and training.

Need a manual for SS/Ls with written guidelines and instructions.

SS/Ls need a clear idea of what is expected of them.

The program suffers from lack of leadership.